REMARKS

Applicants respond hereby to the outstanding Office Action mailed March 9, 2007, in the above-identified application. Claims 1-23 remain pending hereafter, where claims 1 and 10 are the independent claims. Claims 20, 21 and 23 are amended hereby.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 20, 21 and 23 were rejected under 35 USC §101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter in that they lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or manufacture under Section 101, or the steps or acts to comprise a process under Section 101.

In addition to the rejections under Section 101, claims 1-19 and 22 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as anticipated by US Patent No. 5,414,844 to Wang. With respect to independent claims 1 and 10, the Examiner asserts that Wang discloses a method and apparatus for controlling access to an object in a data processing system, including receiving an access request to access the object from a task (col. 5, lines 60-63); classifying the access request into one of critical and non-critical classes in dependence on stored access control data associated with the object and the task (col. 5, line 66 through col. 6, line 8); granting the task access to the object and storing data indicative of the access in an access log if the access is classified into the non-critical class (col. 6, lines 8-1); and, in the event that the access is classified into the critical class, granting or denying the task access to the object in dependence on the contents of the access log and the stored access control data (col. 6, lines 12-23).

Response To Rejections Under 35 USC §101

In response to the rejection of claims 20, 21 and 23 under 35 USC §101, applicants have amended claims 20, 21 and 23.

6

Claim 20 as amended now recites a computer program product, the computer program product comprising a tangible storage medium readable by a processing circuit and storing instructions for execution by the processing circuit for performing a method as recited in claim 1. Claim 21 now recites an article of manufacture comprising a computer usable medium for storing computer readable instructions, which instructions, when processed by a data processing system, cause the data processing system to execute the steps set forth in the method of claim 1. And claim 23 now recites a data processing system, the data processing system comprising an apparatus for controlling access to at least one object in the data processing system, wherein said apparatus is set forth in claim 10.

As amended, claims 20, 21 and 23 now clearly set forth the physical articles or objects, and series of steps or acts to render each of the rejected claims fully statutory within the meaning of Section 101, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 20, 21 and 23 under Section 101.

Response To Rejections Under 35 USC § 102

In response to the rejection of claims 1-19 and 22, applicants respectfully assert that the rejected claims are not anticipated by Wang.

Applicants' independent claim 1 sets forth a method for controlling access to an object in a data processing system. The method includes steps for receiving an access request to access the object from a task, classifying the access request into one of critical and non-critical classes in dependence on stored access control data associated with the object and the task, granting the task access to the object and storing data indicative of the access in an access log if the access is classified into the non-critical class and in the event that the access is classified into

the critical class, granting or denying the task access to the object in dependence on the contents of the access log and the stored access control data.

Applicants' independent claim 10 sets forth an apparatus for controlling access to an object in a data processing system. The apparatus includes an access control data store for storing access control data associated with the object and the task; an access log, access control logic for receiving a request to access the object from a task, decision classifier logic, connected to the access control logic, the access control data store, and the access log, for classifying the access request into one of critical and non-critical classes in dependence on the access control data, and, in the event that the access is classified into the non-critical class, for granting the task access to the object and storing data indicative of the access in the access log and access control decision logic connected to the access control logic, the access log, the access control data store, and the decision classifier logic, for, in the event that the access is classified into the critical class, granting or denying the task access to the object in dependence on the contents of the access log and the access control data.

Wang, as distinguished from applicants' invention as claimed, teaches a method and system for controlling access to a plurality of data objects stored in a data processing system. The Wang method and system use an access control profile associated with each data object that includes an explicit authorization parameter listing user identities and authorization levels, a shared authorization parameter listing the identity of a plurality of users and authorization level granted to each listed user, and a public authorization parameter listing the authorization level granted to each user not specifically set forth in the access control profile. A single public user identity is then defined for all users not specifically set forth within the access control profile. That identity as well as a public authorization level for an entire group of data objects is listed

8

within a single shared authorization parameter. A reference to the shared authorization parameter is placed within the group so that public access to the entire group of data objects may be centrally controlled by means of a single shared authorization parameter.

Wang's Specification at col. 5, line 66, through col. 6, line 11, describes the access. "After access of a particular document has been requested, as determined in block 82, block 84 illustrates a determination of whether or not the user requesting access is a listed user. By "listed user" what is meant is a user whose identity is specifically set forth within ACMO for the document in question. If the user requesting access to the document is a listed user, as determined in block 84, block 86 illustrates a determination of whether or not the user in question possesses a sufficient authority level for the action desired. If not, an error message is returned, as illustrated in block 88. If the user in question has sufficient authority level for the action desired, then access is granted, as depicted in block 90."

While the Examiner asserts that Wang discloses controlling access to an object at col. 6, lines 60-63, in a data processing system by receiving an access request to access the object from a task, and classifying the access request into one of critical and non-critical classes in dependence on stored access control data associated with the object and the task at col. 5, line 66, through col. 6, line 8, applicants do not find such steps of classifying in the cited Wang text. The cited Wang text merely states that Wang determines whether or not a user requesting access is a listed user, as set forth in an ACMO. Block 84 determines whether the user is a listed user, and block 86 determines the user's authority level. Wang does not disclose a step of classifying access requests into one of critical and non-critical classes in dependence on stored access control data associated with the object and the task.

While the Examiner asserts that Wang discloses granting the task access to the

object and storing data indicative of the access in an access log if the access is classified into the non-critical class, at col. 6, lines 8-11, applicants' careful reading of the cited text does not find support for the Examiner's position. That is, at col. 6, lines 8-11, Wang merely states that if a user in question does not have sufficient authority to access a requested document or object, access to the document is denied, and if the user has sufficient authority, access is granted. Wang does not grant task access to the object and storing data indicative of the access in an access log if the access is classified into the non-critical class.

And while the Examiner asserts that Wang teaches that in the event that the access is classified into the critical class, granting or denying the task access to the object in dependence on the contents of the access log and the stored access control data (col. 6, lines 12-23), applicants again disagree. The cited Wang text merely states that, with respect to block 84, if a user attempting to access is not a user specifically set forth in a ACMO for the document in question, block 94 determines whether a public authority parameter includes a reference to a shared authority parameter. If not, an error is returned and access denied, and if so, access is limited by the shared authorization parameter. Wang does not teach or suggest that in the event that the access is classified into the critical class, granting or denying the task access to the object in dependence on the contents of the access log and the stored access control data at col. 6, lines 12-23.

Applicants, therefore, respectfully assert that independent claims 1 and 10 are not anticipated by Wang for at least the reasons set forth, and request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1 and 10 under Section 102(e) in view of Wang. Claims 2-9 and 20-22 depend from claim 1, and are patentable therewith. Likewise, claims 11-19 and 23 depend from claim 10, and

10

are patentable therewith. Applicants further request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-9

and 11-23 under Section 102(e) in view of Wang

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with applicants' attorneys

would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is asked to telephone the

undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

John F. Vodopia
Registration No. 36,299
Attorney for Applicants

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

JFV:gc

11